

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Before this Amendment, claims 1, 3-9, 11-13, 15, 16 and 19 were present for examination. Claims 1, 9 and 16 are amended. Claims 6 and 7 are canceled, and claims 21 and 22 are added. Therefore, claims 1, 3-5, 8, 9, 11-13, 15, 16, 19, 21 and 22 are present for examination, and claims 1, 9 and 16 are the independent claims. No new matter is added by the amendments, as support for the amendments may be found in the Specification (Original Application, p. 10, ll. 12-16, p. 11, ll. 15-18, p. 12, ll. 14-21). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims as amended.

The Office Action dated August 28, 2006 ("Office Action") rejected claims 16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,570,983 to Speeney et al. ("Speeney"). The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,728,354 to Fleck et al. ("Fleck") in view of Speeney. The Office Action rejected claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fleck in view of the cited portions of Speeney and further in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,637 to Kredo ("Kredo"). The Office Action rejected claims 9-13, 15, 16, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fleck in view of the cited portions of Speeney and further in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0094076 to Chen ("Chen").

35 U.S.C. §§ 102/103 Rejections, Speeney, Fleck, Kredo, Chen

As noted above, the Office Action rejected independent claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fleck in view of Speeney. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art references must "teach or suggest all the claim limitations." MPEP § 2143.

The Office Action also rejected independent claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Speeney. For a valid anticipation rejection, the Office must show that each limitation from the claims appears in a single piece of prior art.

The cited reference cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest 1) converting a personalized pre-recorded voice announcement associated with an identifier to digitized text, as generally recited in claims 1, 9 and 16, or 2) displaying the digitized text *and* playing a pre-recorded voice announcement at the terminal location, as generally recited in claims 1 and 9.

The cited references do not suggest the conversion to text of a pre-recorded voice announcement for alerting a user of an incoming phone call. Nor do they suggest displaying the text together with playing the voice announcement.

Because the cited references do not teach the limitations at issue, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 9 and 16 are allowable for at least the above reasons. Claims 3-5, 8, 11-13, 15, 19, 21 and 22 each depend from the independent claims, and these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as given above. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 28, 2006

/Michael L. Drapkin/
Michael L. Drapkin
Reg. No. 55,127

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
MLD/jln
60874113 v1